



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,815	11/20/2001	Takashi Umemoto	011548	8820
23850	7590	01/23/2003		
ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER	
			HAM, SEUNGSOOK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2817	

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/988,815	UMEMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner Seungsook Ham	Art Unit 2817

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Z.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Species I (claims 1-8) in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 9-22 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Species II-IV, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 10.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is too long. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 7, "the sectional shape" lacks antecedent basis. Moreover, "the sectional shape groove is deepest at the center of said groove and mirror-symmetrical" is vague and indefinite as to how this limitation is related to claim 6, and what element is being "mirror-symmetrical."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okada et al. (JP '301).

Okada et al. (figs. 12(a), 12(b)) discloses a magnetostatic wave device/filter/resonator 62 comprising: a magnetic layer 66 having first 18 and 38a and second end 38b, 18 surfaces made of a magnetostatic wave material (YIG), wherein a magnetostatic wave propagates between the first and second end surfaces; the second end surface has a first part (the area at 38b) have a first interval with respect to the first end surface (the edge surface near 38a, 18) and a second part (the edge surface near 38b, 18) having a second interval different from the first interval with respect to the first end surface.

Regarding claim 2, the first part 38b is arranged in parallel with the first end surface (the edge surface near 38a, 18) at the first interval, and the second part (the edge surface near 38b, 18) is arranged in parallel with the first end surface (the edge surface near 38a, 18) at the second interval.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al. (JP '301).

Providing an additional magnetic layer is considered as an obvious modification since Okada et al. (fig. 1) discloses two magnetic layers, and input and output lines are on a respective layer to form a filter characteristic.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 6 and 8 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art does not show "said magnetic layer is separated into a plurality of magnetic layers by at least one groove formed between said first and second end surfaces, and said groove has a stepwise section having at least one step" as recited in claim 6.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kinoshita et al. and Kunz et al. disclose a conventional magnetostatic wave device; and

Adam discloses a magnetostatic wave device having a ground plane with a stepwise section.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seungsook Ham whose telephone number is (703) 308-4090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Pascal can be reached on (703)308-4909. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.



Seungsook Ham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2817

sh
January 13, 2003